

SN. 09/845,787

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. FUJI:187

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 remain pending in this application for which applicants seek reconsideration.

Amendment

Claim 18 has been amended to recite a plurality of output terminals. Support for this amendment can be found at least in original claim 18. No new matter has been introduced.

Allowable Claims

Claims 6 and 10-17 have been allowed.

Art Rejection

Claims 1, 7-9, 18, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Cameron (USP 6,094,026) in view of Barritt (USP 5,648,008). Claims 18 and 19 stand further rejected under § 103(a) as unpatentable over these references in view of Shigekane (USP 5,115,388). Finally, claims 2-5 stand rejected under § 103(a) as unpatentable over Cameron in view of Barritt and Mano (*Computer System Architecture*). Applicants traverse these rejections because the applied references would not have taught at least the claimed abnormal condition output means as set forth in claims 1 and 18.

Claim 1 calls for an abnormal condition output means having at least one output terminal for outputting alarm signals to outside when the abnormal condition detecting means detects the fatal abnormal condition and for outputting abnormality factor discrimination signals indicating abnormality factors contributing to the fatal abnormal condition and the precursory abnormal condition. Claim 18 is similar to claim 1, except that it calls for a plurality of output terminals.

In the previous reply, applicants argued that, although Cameron and Barritt include a power supply and means for protecting their devices against abnormal conditions, they would not have suggested or taught the output means for externally outputting alarm signals and abnormality factor discrimination signals indicating abnormality factors contributing to the fatal abnormal condition and the precursory abnormal condition, as set forth in claims 1 and 18. In response, the examiner argues that Cameron discloses all of the aspects of the claimed

SN. 09/845,787

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. FUJI:187

invention except for outputting an alarm signal indicative of the fatal abnormal conditions. In this regard, the examiner argues that Barritt teaches outputting an alarm signal indicative of the fatal abnormal conditions at column 15, lines 1-18, and outputting abnormality factor discriminating signals at column 15, lines 12-14.

Applicants disagree with the examiner's assessment of the applied references. In column 15, lines 1-18, Barritt discloses an overheat protector 78 that shuts the power inverter circuit 12 in response to a temperature sensor 79 detecting a fatal overheating condition, and also outputs an audio alarm via the microprocessor 54 when it detects the fatal overheating condition. The overheat protector 78 generates a signal for shutting the power inverter circuit 12 only when the temperature sensor 79 detects the fatal overheating condition. The overheat protector 78 merely acts as an ON-OFF switch. Accordingly, it is clear that the overheat protector 78 would not have taught outputting abnormality factor discriminating signals or different types of alarm signals.

Cameron discloses generating a precursory abnormal condition signal (e.g., temperature exceeding a first predetermined temperature) for controlling the speed of the motor (i.e., reducing the motor speed if the temperature exceeds the first predetermined temperature). Cameron also discloses generating a fatal condition signal (e.g., temperature exceeding a second predetermined temperature) for stopping the motor. In both instances, the abnormal and fatal condition signals are directed internally to the motor control. In this respect, the examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to externally output an alarm indicative of the detection of the fatal condition per the teaching of Barritt. Note that the claims call for externally outputting the abnormality factor discriminating signals indicative of the abnormality factors contributing to the fatal abnormal condition and the precursory abnormal condition. Granted that an alarm can be desirable for alerting the fatal condition to the user, however, applicants submit that neither Cameron nor Barritt would have taught or motivated externally outputting the abnormality factor discriminating signals as set forth in claims 1 and 18.

The other applied references, namely Shigekane and Mano, would not have alleviated the shortcomings of Cameron and Barritt.

SN. 09/845,787

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. FUJI:187

Conclusion


Applicants submit that claims 1-19 patentably distinguish over the applied references and are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicants urge the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

January 31, 2005

Date



Lyle Kimms
Reg. No. 34,079

P.O. BOX 826
Ashburn, VA 20146-0826
703-726-6020 (Phone)
703-726-6024 (fax)